

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Proposed changes to Figs. 3A-3D are submitted herewith to overcome the objections thereto.

Claims 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, for having an insufficient antecedent basis for the phrase "protruding regions." These claims both recite that "regions at both ends ... protrude from a boundary." However, to clarify any indefiniteness that may exist in original claims 9 and 10, these claims have been amended to recite that "protruding portions at both ends ... protrude from a boundary." These amendments do not narrow the scope of the claimed subject matter in any way.

Claims 5-12 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Murakami (U.S. 4,819,045) in view of Yang (U.S. 6,306,700). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 9 recites, in relevant part:

... a diffusion layer of the first conductivity type formed so as to surround said source side offset diffusion layer, said drain side offset diffusion layer and said gate insulator film so as to be in contact therewith, said diffusion layer of the first conductivity type having a higher impurity concentration than said region of the first conductivity type, and in which protruding portions at both ends, in a direction of a channel width, of said

gate insulator film, protrude from a boundary, in a lateral direction, between said source side offset diffusion layer and said drain side offset diffusion layer,

wherein said diffusion layer of the first conductivity type is formed so as not to be present below said gate insulator film and formed to be in contact with the protruding portions.

Independent claim 10 also recites many of these features.

Particularly, claims 9 and 10 recite "a diffusion layer of the first conductivity type formed so as to surround said source side offset diffusion layer, said drain side offset diffusion layer and said gate insulator film so as to be in contact therewith." Murakami fails to disclose that diffusion layer 15 is in contact with gate insulator film 9.

Moreover, Fig. 1 of Murakami is a cross-sectional view in the direction of the channel length of the gate insulator film and is not a cross-sectional view in the direction of the channel width. As disclosed by Applicant, the direction of the channel width is the direction of I-I' of Figs. 1A and 2A. By contrast, Fig. 1 of Murakami is a cross-sectional view in an arrangement direction the source 5 and the drain 7, that is, a cross-sectional view in the direction of the channel length.

When viewed according to its proper perspective, Fig. 1 of Murakami does not disclose that both ends of the gate insulator film region, in the direction of the channel width, protrude from

the regions of the source diffusion layer and the drain diffusion layer, as recited in claims 9 and 10. Furthermore, Murakami fails to disclose that the diffusion layer of the first conductivity type is not present below the gate insulator film and is formed so as to be in contact with the protruding portions, as recited in claim 9.

The transistor disclosed by Murakami is completely different from the transistor of the present invention. Therefore, the structure of claims 9 and 10 cannot be obtained by applying the source/drain offset structure taught by Yang to the transistor of Murakami.


Moreover, with regard to claim 10, Murakami fails to disclose forming the claimed diffusion layer of the first conductivity type so as to be separate from the protruding portions at both ends, in the direction of the channel width, of the gate insulator film. Therefore, claim 10 distinguishes over the combined references for this additional reason.

In summary, the combined references fail to teach or suggest all of the claimed features and the benefits accruing from them. Therefore, allowance of independent claims 9 and 10 and all claims dependent therefrom is warranted.

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

If any issues remain which may best be resolved through a telephone communication, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at the local Washington, D.C. telephone number listed below.

Date: November 12, 2002
JEL/DWW/att

Respectfully submitted,

James E. Ledbetter
Registration No. 28,732

Attorney Docket No. L8462.01101
STEVENS DAVIS, MILLER & MOSHER, L.L.P.
1615 L Street, N.W., Suite 850
P.O. Box 34387
Washington, D.C. 20043-4387
Telephone: (202) 408-5100
Facsimile: (202) 408-5200